



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/776,171	02/02/2001	Sasa Buvac	S00-171	2207

7590

01/31/2006

JEANEAH PAIK

in care of Williams C. Paik

14836 SATANAS ST.

SAN DIEGO, CA 92129-1527

EXAMINER

HUYNH, CONG LAC T

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2178

DATE MAILED: 01/31/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/776,171	Applicant(s) BUVAC ET AL.	
	Examiner Cong-Lac Huynh	Art Unit 2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 November 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 57-59 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 57-59 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: amendment filed 11/14/05 to the application filed on 2/2/01, priority 2/3/00.
2. Claims 1-56 are canceled.
3. Claims 57-59 are added.
4. Claims 57-59 are pending in the case. Claims 57 and 59 are independent claims.
5. The indicated allowability of claim 27, which is deleted and included in the new claim 59, is withdrawn in view of the reference Ong (US Pat App Pub No 2005/0108626).
6. The indicated allowability of claim 55 is withdrawn since it is written by mistake.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

8. Claims 57-58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Okamoto (US Pat No. 6,572,660 B1, 6/3/03, filed 8/18/99).

Regarding independent claim 57, Okamoto discloses:

- removing user-selected content from a parent context (**col 7, lines 37-45**: “.. removing the associated source-visual element 70 (figure 5) from the original view ...”; **figures 5-6, 9, 13**: the selected text 70 “History is outdated ... heroin” is removed from the parent page 60)
- creating and automatically naming a new context comprising said user-selected content (**col 1, line 43 to col 2, line 12**: “... (c) *automatically creates new documents on the fly as needed*; ... (e) *automatically titles newly created documents* ..”; **figure 13**: the new context comprising the selected content “History is outdated ... heroin” is created and named “Favorite quotes”; **figure 15C, #318**: “*Create new document*; move selected source object to new document; create hyperlink from HVE to new document; *label new document* with representation of HVE..”; note: HVE stands for hyperlink visual elements)
- inserting a reference to said new context in said parent context, wherein said reference comprises a uniquely identifying function of a name of said new context (**figures 8A-D, col 4, line 36 to col 5, line 36**: inserting the hyperlink feature to the text “Favorite quotes” in the parent sticky6 to make it a hyperlink, where the hyperlink is equivalent to the reference and the hyperlink comprises the name “Favorite quotes” of the sticky 78, which is equivalent to a new context of the claimed invention)
- wherein said reference is inserted in the place of said removed user-selected content, and wherein the method is used for purposes comprising web authoring,

hypertext editing, and web logging (**figures 8A-D, col 4, line 36 to col 5, line 36, col 1, lines 43-61**: creating and editing hyperlinked documents shows hypertext editing and web authoring since hypertext documents are used in the web, also since accessing to the web requires logging, web logging is implied).

Regarding claim 58, which is dependent on claim 57, Okamoto discloses:

- said parent context and said new context are selected from the group consisting of files, web pages, windows, frames, buffers, and sticky notes (figure 13), or
- said reference is a hyperlink (figures 8D, 9: the "Favorite quotes" is a hyperlink)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

Art Unit: 2178

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

11. Claim 59 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okamoto (US Pat No. 6,572,660 B1, 6/3/03, filed 8/18/99, priority 8/30/98) in view of Coleman et al. (US Pat No. 6,262,732 B1, 7/17/01, filed 3/24/94) and Ong (US Pat App Pub No 2005/0108626, 5/19/05, priority 12/1/98).

Regarding independent claim 59, Okamoto discloses:

- opening a viewer containing contents of a selected version of said child context, wherein said contents are selected in part in dependence on a user-selected reference in said parent context to said child context (**figures 5, 8D, 13**: the view of the hyperlink document "Favorite quotes" 78 in figure 13 is opened containing contents of a selected version of the child context where said contents are selected as in 70 in figure 5 in dependence on a user-selected reference Favorite quotes 74 in the parent context 60 in figure 8D, to the child context Favorite quotes 78 as seen in figure 13; **col 8, lines 59-64**: "...When the primary mouse *button 12 is depressed while the pointer is over the hyperlink-visual element 74, views associated with each hyperlinked documents 76 and 78 are displayed in separate hypermedia processing windows*")

Okamoto does not disclose creating and saving a new version of said child context comprising said contents.

Coleman discloses editing a sticky note where a sticky note can be an annotation to be added to or removed from a document (col 13, line 57 to col 14, line 10, col 8, lines 30-57).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Coleman into Okamoto since Coleman has the capability of editing a sticky note providing the advantage to incorporate into Okamoto to modify a linked document in form of a sticky note as in figure 13 and to make a new version of said document as well as save it for later use in addition to merely creating the linked document as in Okamoto.

Okamoto and Coleman do not disclose that said version of said child context are stored in a single directory, the name of said directory comprising a uniquely identifying function of a timestamp at which said original child context was created.

Ong discloses using a dated URL for the directory structure that stores the web site contents according to some sort of chronological directory structure ([0043]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Ong into Okamoto and Coleman since the *dated* URL for the directory structure in Ong is considered the name of the directory with a unique function of a timestamp at which different versions of the website contents are stored. This further suggests the timestamp included in the dated URL, which is a hyperlink, be for the time of creation of the original context instead of the consequence versions of said context in Okamoto and Coleman.

Conclusion

12. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Tagawa (US Pat No. 5,991,773, 11/23/99, filed 4/29/97).

Fleskes (US Pat No. 6,529,910, 3/4/03, filed 9/16/99, priority 9/18/98).

Fields et al. (US Pat No. 6,338,059, 1/8/02, filed 12/17/98).

Dutta (US Pat App Pub No. 2002/0078102, 6/20/02, filed 12/18/00).

Hennings et al. (US Pat App Pub No. 2004/0215664, 10/28/04, priority 3/31/99).

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cong-Lac Huynh whose telephone number is 703-305-0432. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri (8:30-6:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on 703-308-5465. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2178

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Cong-Lac Huynh
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2178
01/23/06